

### *REMARKS*

This amendment responds to the Office Action mailed April 14, 2006. In the Office Action the Examiner:

- rejected claims 13 and 15 as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph;
- rejected claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Kleveland (US 5,528,168); and
- rejected claims 16-17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kleveland (US 5,528,168) in view of Manapat et al. (US 6,541,998).

After entry of this amendment, the pending claims are: claims 1-2, 4-12, 14-17

### *REMARKS CONCERNING FIGURES*

Replacement drawings for Figures 1-11 are included in Appendix A. Please replace the originally filed drawings with the drawings enclosed herewith. Each drawings sheet has been labeled as "Replacement Sheet." No new matter has been added by the replacement of these drawings.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to approve the proposed drawing changes.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112*

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Applicants respectfully disagree. The term cross-over is used to describe the point at which two signals are momentarily at the same voltage. The crossing of a variable voltage and a reference voltage is described in paragraph 0063 of the specification:

“... the input sampler 940 would continue to monitor the positive terminal 945 for the input signal and compare it with the reference voltage. When the input signal at the positive terminal 945 crosses the reference voltage, the input sampler 940 asynchronously triggers and generates the output signal at the output terminal 980.”

Because the term cross-over has a definite and specific meaning in the context of this invention, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdrawal rejection of claim 15.

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102***

The Examiner rejected claim 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Kleveland*. Please note the amendments to claims 1 and 6 above. In light of the amended claims, the Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse.

*Kleveland* discloses the termination of an input signal line between a power supply voltage  $V_{cc}$  and ground  $V_{ss}$  based on the voltage level of the input signal (column 5, lines 60-67). In other words, *Kleveland* merely discloses the use of two termination voltage levels, one of which is ground.

By contrast, the claimed method of terminating a transmission line is capable of terminating a variety of different voltage levels by providing a means to change the termination voltage that is "... configured to select at least one of the first and second voltage levels from a plurality of voltage levels including two or more voltage levels that differ from ground," as claimed.

Because *Kleveland* does not describe selecting one of a plurality of non-ground termination voltages, it does not teach or anticipate claims 1 and 6. The Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of claims 1 and 6 for this reason. Furthermore, dependant claims 2, 4-5, 7-12, and 14-17 include all the limitations of claims 1 and 6. Therefore, claims dependant claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider this application with a view towards allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (650) 843-4000, if a telephone call could help resolve any remaining items.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 14, 2006

/ Gary S. Williams /

Gary S. Williams

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

2 Palo Alto Square

3000 El Camino Real, Suite 700

Palo Alto, CA 94306

(650) 843-4000

31,066

(Reg. No.)

Appendix A  
Replacement Figures